A SPEECH

MATIONAL POLITICS

Delivered at the Cooper Institute Last Evening. BY

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, of Illinois.

The Hon. ARRAM LINCOLN of Illinois, the great an Dependent of Senator Douglas, gave last evening, in the Dosper Institute, a lecture on National Politics. Although there was an admission fee for the benefit of the Plymouth church course of lectures, the seats of the great hall were nearly all filled, and a large number of people preferred standing to sitting in the rear seats. Upon the platform were ex-Gov. John A. King, David Dudley Field, Wm. C. Bryant, Gen. James W. Nye, Alms-House Governors I-asc J. Ouver and Washington Smits, E. Deinfield Smits, Dr. S. Lounsberry, A. J Dittenhoeffer, eeq., Judge E. D. Culver, odore Tilton, Thomas B. Stillman, Samuel Sinclair, J. S. Gibbons; in fine it was crowded with distinguiched Republicans. A considerable number of ndies graced the occasion by their presence.

Mr. Lincoln was escorted into the room by David Dedley Field and Wm. C. Bryant, amid loud and pro-

Fellow Republicans: I beg leave to no Fellow Republicans: I beg leave to nominate a Chairman of th's meeting a Republican whom you all know well—William Cullen Bryant. [Cheers.] Those of you who are in favor of Mr. Bryant will say Aye. [General ard thundrous "sye."] Those of you who are not in favor will say No. [Sidence.] There is no No. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Bryast, on taking the chair said:

Mr frienda, it is a grateful office that I perform in biroducing to you at this time an eminent citizen of the West whom you know, or whom you have known hitherto only by fame, but who has consented to address a New-York assemblage this evening. The Great West, my friends, is a potent anxiliary in the battle we are lighting for Freedom against the battle we are lighting for Freedom against the battle we are lighting for Freedom against barbarism; for the occupation of some of the fairest regions of our continent, on which the settlers are now building their cabins. I say a higher and a wiser agency than that of man in the catass that have filled with a hardy population the wast and fervice region which forms the western part of the Valley of the Missiscippi, a race of man who are not assumed to till their acres with their own hands, and who would be ashamed to subsist by the abor of the save. [Cheers.] These children of the West, my friends, form a living wull tark against the advances of Slavery, and from them is recuited the vanguard of the armies of Literty. [Applayse.] One of them will appear before you this evening. I pre-ent to you a gallant colder of the political campaign of 1850, who then readered good serve to the Republican cause. and who was since the champion of that cause in the struggic which took place two years later for the sa-Mr. BRYANT, on taking the chair, said: then rendered good service to the Republican cause, and who was since the chumpion of that cause in the struggle which took place two years later for the saperemety in the Legislature of Illinois, who took the field then against Douglas, and who would have then won victory hat for the unjust apportionment law of the State, which allowed a minerity of the people to elect the majority of the Legislature. I have only, my friends, to pronounce the name of Abram Lincoln of Illinois [lond cheering]—I have only to pronounce his manner, to secure your profoundest attention. [Continued applause, and "Thhree cheers for Abram Lincoln!"

Mr. Lincoln then, after prolot god applause, said: Mr. President and Fellow-Citezens of New-York: The facts with which I shall deal this evening are manify old and familiar; nor is there anything new in the general use I shall make of them. If there shall be any novelty, it will be in the mode of presenting the facts, and the inferences and observations follow-

In his speech last Automo, at Columbus, Ohio, as reported in The New-York Times, Senator Douglas

Our fathers when they framed the Government

"Our fathers when they framed the Government safer which we live, understood this question just as well, and even better, than we do now."

I fully indone this, and I adopt it as a text for this discours. I so adopt it because it furnishes a precise and an agreed starting point for a discussion between publicans and that wing of the Democracy headed Senator Douglas. It simply leaves the inquiry: "What was the understanding those fathers had of the one stion mentioned!"

westion mentioned?"

What is the frame of Government under which we

The answer must be: "The Constitution of the

The snawer must be: "The Constitution of the United States." That Constitution consists of the original, framed in 1787 (and under which the present Government first went into operation), and twelve subsequently framed amendments, the first ten of which were framed in 1789.

Who were our fathers that framed the Constitution? I suppose the "thirty-nine" who signed the original instrument may be fairly called our fathers who framed that part of the present Government. It is almost exactly true to say they framed it, and it is allocated the original to the whole nation at that time. Their names being familiar to nearly all, and accessible to quite all need not now be repeated.

This these "thirty-nine" for the present, as being

all, need not now be repeated.

I take these "thirty-nise" for the present, as being that the thirty-nise of the foreign that the first thirty-nise is the first thirty-nise is the first thirty-nise.

What is the question which, according to the text, these lathers understood just as well, and even better

Han we do now?
If is this: Does the proper division of local from Pederal authority, or anything in the Constitution, for-bid our Federal Government to control as to Slavery

our Federal Territories?
Upon th's, Douglas holds the affirmative, and Republicans the negative. This affirmative and Re-form an issue; and this issue—this question—is pre-cisely what the text declares our fathers understood before than we.

Let us now inquire whether the "thirty-nine" or

any of them, ever acted upon this question; and if they did, how they acted upon it—how they expressed that

better understanding.

In 1784—three years before the Constitution—the United States then owning the North-Western Territory, and no other—the Congress of the Confederation had before them the question of prohibiting Slavery in that Territory; and four of the "thirty-nine" who afterward framed the Constitution were in that Congress, and voted on that question. Of these, Roger Sherman, Thomas Millim, and Hugh Williamson voted for the prohibition—thus showing that, in their underfor the prohibition—thus showing that, in their understanding, no line dividing local from Federal authority, nor any thing else, properly forbade the Federal Government to control as to Slavery in Federal territory.

The other of the four—James McHenry—voted against the prohibition, showing that, for some cause, he thought it improper to vote for it.

the prohibition, showing that, for some came, he thought it improper to vote for it.

In 1787, still before the Constitution, but while the Convention was in session staming it, and while the Korh-Western Toy-ory still was the only territory wheel by the ravided States—the same question of prohibiting cavery in the Territory again came be-tongress of the Confederation; and three the "thirty-nine" who afterward signed the confederation, were in that Congress, and voted on the question. They were William Blount, William Few, and Abraham Baldwin; and they all voted for the promisition—thus showing that, in their understanding, no

and Abraham Baldwin; and they all voted for the promisition—thus showing that, in their understanding, no him dividing local from Federal authority, nor anything clae, properly forbade the Federal Government to control as to Slavery in Federal territory. This time the prohibition became a law, being a part of what is now well known as the Ordinance of '87.

The question of Federal control of Slavery in the Convention which framed the original Constitution; and hence it is not recorded that the "thirty-nine" or any of them, while engaged on that instrument, expressed any opinion on that precise question.

In 1783, by the first Congress which sat under the Constitution, an act was passed to enforce the Ordinance of '87, including the prohibition of Slavery in the North-Western Territory. The bill for this act was reported by one of the "thirty-nine," Thomas Fitzsimmons, then a Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania. It went through all its cages without a word of opposition, and finally passed both branches without Yeas and Nays, which is a quivalent to a unanimous passage. In this Congress there were eixteen of the "thirty-nine" sthere who framed the original Constitution. They were:

John Lavedon.

These Fitzsimmons, Richard Bassett, William Few.

George Enger.

Roger Sherman, Robert Morris,

Thes. Fitzeinmons.

Richard Bassett,
William Sew.
Abraham Baidwin,
Rofus King,
William Fatterson,
George Clyma,
George Clyma, This shows that, in their understanding, no line

viding local from Federal authority, nor anything in the Constitution, properly forbade Congress to prohibi Slavery in the Federal territory; else both their fidel ity to correct principle, and their oath to support the Constitution, would have constrained them to oppose the prohibition.

Again, George Washington, another of the "thirty-

Again, George Washington, another of the "thirty-nine," was ther President of the United States, and as such, approved and signed the bill, thus completing fit validity as a law, and thus showing that, in his units validity as a law, and thus showing that, in als un-derstanding, no line dividing local from Federal an-thority nor anything in the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control as to Slavery in Fed-

eral territory.

No great while after the adoption of the original Constitution, North Carolina ceded to the Federal

iana. New-Orleans, lying within that part, was an old and comparatively large city. There were other considerable towns and settlements, and Slavery was extensively and thoroughly intermingled with the people. Congress did not, in the Territorial act, prohibit Slavery; but they did interfere with it—take control of it—in a more marked and extensive way than they did in the case of Mississippi. The substance of the provision therein made, in relation to slaves.

slaves, was:
First: That no slave should be imported into the

Trist: That no slave should be imported into the Territory from foreign par's.

Second: That no slave should be carried into it who had been imported into the United States since the first day of May, 1798.

Third: That no slave should be carried into it, except by the owner, and for his own use as a settler; the penalty in all the cases being a fine upon the violator of the law, and freedom to the slave.

This set who was proceed without Yeas and Nays.

the peralty in all the cases being a fine upon the violator of the law, and freedom to the slave.

This act also was pussed without Yeas and Nays.
In the Congress which passed it, there were two of
the "thirty-nine." They were Abraham Baldwin and
Jonathan Inyton. As stated in the case of Mississippi,
it is probable they both voted for it. They would not
have allowed it to pass without recording their opposition to it, if, in their understanding, it violated either
the line properly div ding local from Federal anthority
or any provision of the Constitution.

In 1819-20, came, and passed, the Missouri question.
Many votes were taken, by Yeas and Nays, in both
branches of Congress, upon the various plasses of the
general question. Two of the "thirty-nine"—Rufas
King and Charles Pinchney—were members of that
Congress. Mr. King steadyly voted for Savery prohibition and against all compromises, while Mr. Pinckney as eteacity voted against Slavery prohibition and against all compromises, while Mr. Pinckney as eteacity voted against Slavery prohibition in the account of the constitution, was
violated by Congress probibiting Slavery in Federal
territory; while Mr. Pinckney, by his votes, showed
that in his understanding there was some sufficient
reason for opposing such probibition in that case.

The cases I have mentioned are the oofy acts of the

that in his understanding there was some sufficient reason for opposing such prohibition in that case.

The case is I have mentioned are the only acts of the "thirty-nine," or of any of them, upon the direct issue, which I have been able to discover.

To enumerate the persons who thus acted, as being feur in 1784, three in 1787, teventeen in 1789, three in 1798, two in 1894, and two in 1819-26—there would be thirty-one of them. But this would be counting John Langdon, Roger Sherman, William Few, Rufus King, and George Read, each twice, and Abruham Baldwin four times. The true number of those of the "thirty-nine" whom I have shown to have acted upon the question, which, by the text, they unders ood better than we, is twenty-three, leaving eixteen not shown

question, which, by the text, they unders ood better than we, is twenty-three, leaving sixteen not shown to have acted upon it in any way.

Here, then, we have twenty three of our "thirty-nee" fathers who framed the Government under which we live, who have, upon their official responsibility and their corporal oaths, acted upon the very question which the text affirms they "understood just as well, and even better than we do now;" and twenty-one of them—a clear majority of the whole "thirty-nine"—so acting upon it as to make them guilty of gross political impropriety, and willful perjury, if, in their understanding, any proper division between local and Federal authority, or anything in the Constitution they had made themselves, and sworn to support, forbade the Federal Government to control as to Slavery in the Federal Territories. Thus the twenty-one acted, and, as actions speak louder than words, so actions under

Federal Territories. Thus the twenty-one acted; and, as actions a cak louder than words, so actions under such responsibility speak still louder.

Two of the twenty-three voted against Congressional prohibition of Slavery in the Federal Territories, in the meances in which they acted upon the question. But for what reasons they so voted is not known. They may have done so because they thought a proper division of local from Federal authority, or some provision or principle of the Constitution, stood in the way: or they may, without any such question, have voted against the prohibition, on what appeared to them to be sufficient grounds of expediency. No one who has sworn to support the Constitution, can conscientiously vote for what he understands to be an unconstitutional measure, however expedient he may scientiously vote for what he understance to be an acconstitutional measure, however expedient he may think it; but one may and ongot to vote against a measure which he deems constitutional, if, at the same time, he deems it in expedient. It, therefore, would be unsafe to set down even the two who voted against the prohibition, as having done so because, in their understanding, any proper division of local from Federal standing, any proper division of local from Federal standing, any proper division of local from Federal he Federal Government to control as to Slavery in

rederal territory.

The remaining sixteen of the "thirty-nine," so far an I have discovered, have left no record of their un-derstanding upon the direct question of Federal con-trel of Slavery in the Federal Territories. But there is much reason to believe that their understanding apon that question would not have appeared different from that of their twenty three compeers, had it been mani-

For the purpose of adhering rividly to the text. I have purposely omitted whatever understanding may have been manifested, by any person, however dis-tinguished, other than the thirty-nine fathers who who framed the eriginal Constitution; and, for the same reason, I have also omitted whatever understand-ing may have been manifested by any of the "thirtying analy have been manifested by any of the "thirty-nine" even, on any other phase of the general ques-tion of Slavery. If we should look into their ac s and declarations on those other phases, as the foreign slave-trade, and the morality and policy of Slavery general-ly, it would appear to us that on the direct question of Federal control of Slavery in Federal Territories, the sixteen, it they had acted at all, would probably have sixteen, I they had sixed at all, word a place of the acted just as the twenty-three d.d. Among that exteen were several of the most noted Anti-Slavery men of those times—as Dr. Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, and Gouverneur Morrie—while there was not one now known to have been otherwise, unless it may be John

Rulledge of South Carolina.

The sum of the whole is, that of our "thirty-nine" fathers who framed the original Constitution, twenty-nine a clear majority of the whole centainly understood that no proper division of local from Federal authority, nor any part of the Constitution, forbade the Federal Government to control Slavery in the Federal Territories; while all the rest probably had the same understancing. Such, unquestionably, was the under-standing of our fathers who framed the original Con-stitution; and the text affirms that they understood the

question batter than we.
Eut, so far, I have been considering the understandand so far, I have been considering use unders and ing of the question manifested by the framers of the original Concitution. In, and by, the original instru-ment, a mode was provided for amending it; and, as I have already stated, the present frame of Government have already stated, the present frame of Government under which we live comists of that original, and twelve comendatory articles framed and adopted since. Those who now insistant Federal control of Slavery in Faderal Territories violates the Constitution, point nato the provisions which they suppose it thus violates; and, as I understand, they all fix upon provisions in those amendatory articles, and not in the visions in these amendatory articles, and not need original instrument. The Supreme Court, in the Drad Scott case, plant themselves upon the fifth amendment, Scott case, plant themselvos upon the fifth amenidment, which provides that "no person shall be deprived of property without due process of law;" while Senator Douglas and his peculiar adherents plant themselves upon the teath amendment, providing that "the powers not granted by the Constitution, are reserved to the States respectively, and to the people."

Now, it so buspens that these amendments were framed by the first Congress which sat under the Constitution—the identical Congress which passed the act of ready mentioned, enforcing the granibition of Slavery

sitution—the identical Congress which passed the act a ready mentioned enforcing the prohibition of Slavery in the North-Western Territory. Not cally was it the same Congress, but they were the identical, same individual men who, at the same session, and at the same time within the session, had under consideration, and in progress toward muturity, these Constitutional amendments and this act prohibiting Slavery in all the territory the nation then owned. The Constitutional approximents were introduced here. The Constitutional assendments were introduced ho-fere and passed after 22s act enforcing the Ordinance of '87; so that during the whole pendency of the act to enforce the Ordinance, the Constitutional amend-ments was also onts were also pending.
That Congress, consisting in all of seventy six mem

ers, including sixteen of the framers of the original Constitution, as before stated, were preeminently our fathers who framed that part of the Government under which we live which is now claimed as forbidding the Fr deral Government to control Slavery in the

Federal Territories.

Is it not a little presumptuous in any one at this day to affirm that the two things which that Congress de-

Government the country now constituting the State of Tennessee; and a few years later Georgie ceded that which now constitutes the States of Mississippi and Alabsma. In both deeds of cession it was made a condition by the ceding States that the Federal Government should not probably state the Federal Government should not probably state the state of the States of Mississippi the state of original constitution, and the seventy within them. But they did interfere with its Slavery was then settable in the ceded country. Slavery within them. But they did interfere with its Slavery within them. But they did interfere with its Slavery within them. But they did interfere with its Slavery within them. But they did interfere with its Slavery within them. But they did interfere with its Slavery within them. But they did interfere with its Slavery within them. But they did interfere with its state control of it—even there, to a certain extent. In take control of it—even there, to a certain extent. In take control of it—even there, to a certain extent in the word and the control of it—even there, to a certain extent. In take control of it—even there, to a certain extent in the word and the control of it—even there, to a certain extent the of slaves into the Territory of Mississippi. It has act of organization they probably were inconsistent better than we—better than we have of the control of it—even there, to a send it makes that the control of it—even there, to a certain extent the whole were in the whole with the control of it—even there, to a send it is surely state to assume that the "thirty-nine" in the cell of the control of it—even there, to a certain extent the control of it—even there, to a certain extent the control of it—even there, to a certain extent the control of it—even there, to a certain extent the control of it—even there, to a certain extent the control of it—even there, to a certain extent the control of it—even the control of it—even the control of it—even the control of it—even the control of it—eve

ment under which we live," but with them all other I vir g men within the century in which it was framed, among whom to search, and they shall not be able to find the evidence of a single man agreeing with them.

Now, and here, let me goard a little against being memoreratood. I do not mean to say we are bound to follow implicitly in whatever our tathers did. To do so, would be to decard all the highest of current experience—to reject all progress—all improvement. What I do say is, that if we would supplant the epinious and policy of our fathers in any case, we should do so upon evidence so conclusive, and argument so do so upon ev denne so conclusive, and argument so clear, hat even their great authority, fairly const to ed

clear, that even their great authority, fairly conside ed and weighed, cannot stand; and most surely not in a case where of we ourselves declare they understood the question better than we.

If any man, at this day, sincerely believes that a proper division of local from Federal authority, or any part of the Constitution, forbids the Federal Government to control as to Slavery in the Federal Territories, he is right to say so, and to enforce his position by all truthful evidence and fair argument which ha can. But he has no right to mi-lead others, who have less access to history and less leisure to study is, into the faire belief that "our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live," were of the same the false belief that "our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live," were of the same opinio —thus substituting falsebood and deception for truthful evidence and fair argument. If any man at this day sincerety believes "our fathers, who framed the Government ander which we hive," used and applied principles, in other cases, which ought to have led them to understand that a proper division of local from F. deral authority, or some part of the Constitution, touches the Federal Government to control as to Slavery in the Federal Territories, he is right to say so. But he should, at the same time, brave the responsibility of declaring that, in its opinion, he understands their principles better than they did themselves; and especially should be not stirk that responsibility by arretting that they "understood the question just as well, and even better, than we do now."

meeting that they "understood the question just as well, and even better, than we do now."

But enough, Let all who believe that "our fathers, who framed the Government under which we live, understeed this question just as well, and even better than we do now." speak as they spoke, and act as they seeked upon it. This is all Republicans ask—all Republicans ceshe—in relation to Slavery. As those fathers marked it, so let it be again marked, as an evil not to be extended, but to be telerated and projected only because of and so far as its actual presence among us makes that teleration and protection a necessity. Let all the anastatics those fathers gave it be, not gradgingly, but fully and fairly, maintained. For this Kepnbucans contend, and with this, so far as I know or believe they will be content. publicans contend, and we see the publicans contend, and we see they will be content.

And now, if they would listen—as I suppose they will not—I would address a few words to the Southern will not—I would not work and the southern will not—I would not work and the southern will not—I would not work and the southern will not

I would say to them: You consider yourselves I would say to them: You consider yourselves a reasonable and a just people; and I consider that in the general qualities of reason and justice you are not inferior to any other people. Sail, when you speak of its Republicans, you do so only to denounce as as repulse, or, at the best, as no better than outlaws. You will great a hearing to pirates or murderers, but nothing the into "Black Republicans." In all your contentiors with one module, each of you deems an unconduleral condemnsation of "Black Republicansm" as the first thing to be situated to. Indeed, such condemnsation of or seems to be an indispensable preas the first thing to be attended to. Indeed, such condemostion of us seems to be an indispensable prerequirit—license, so to speak—among you to be
admitted or permitted to speak at all.

Now, can you, or not, be prevailed upon to pause
and to consider whether this is quite just to us, or
even to yourselves?

even to vourselves?

forward your charges and specifications, and Brity forward your charges and specifications, and then be patient long enough to hear as deny or justify. You say we are sectional. We deny it. That makes an issue; and the barden of proof is upon you. You produce your proof; and what is it? Why, that our party has no existence in your section—peats no votes in your section. The fact is substantially true; but does it prove the issue? If it over, then in case we should, without change of principle, begin to get vates in your section, we should then be ease to be sectional. You cannot seeme this You cannot escape thi thereby cease to be sectional. You cannot escape this conclusion; and yet, are you willing to abide by it? If you are, you will probably seen find that we have cented to be sectional, for we shall get votes in your section this very year. You will then begin to discover, as the trath plainly is, that your proof does not touch the henc. The fact that we get no votes in your section as a fact of your making, and not of ours. And if there be fault in that fact, that fault is primarily yours, and remains so until you show that we repel you by some wrong principle or practice. If we do bereby cease to be sectional. you by some wrong principle or practice. If you by some wrong principle or practice. If we do repel you by any wrong principle or practice, the fault in cure; but this brings you to where you ongut to have statted—to a discussion of the right or wrong of our principle. If our principle, put in practice, would wrong your section for the benefit of oars, or for any ether object, then cur principle, and we with it, are sectional, and are justly opposed and demounced as such. Mesting then, or the question of whether oar principle, put in practice, would wrong your section; and so next it as if it were possible that something may be said on our side. Do you accept the challenge? he said on our side. Do you accept the challen No? Then you remily believe that the principle wr our fathers who framed the Government nader which we live thought so clearly right as to adopt it, and incores it again and again, upon their official oaths, is, in fact, so clearly wrong as to demand d your condemnation without a moment's consideration.

Some of you delight to flaunt in our faces the warning to the state of the

Some of you cargnito had it not interest the warning against rectional parties given by Washington in his Farewell Address. Less than eight years before Washington gave that warning he had, as President of the United States, approved and signed an act of Congress, enforcing the prohibition of Slavery in the of the United States, approved and sighed an act of Congress, enforcing the prohibition of Slavery in the North-Western Territory, which act embodied the policy of the Govornment upon that subject, up to and at the very moment he penned that warning; and about one year after he penned that warning; and about one year after he penned that warning; and that he considered that prohibition a wise measure, expressing in the same connection his hope that we should some time have a confederacy of free States.

should some time have a confederacy of free States. Bearing this in mod, and seeing that sectionalism has ance arisen upon this same subject, is that warning a weapon in your hands against us, or in our hands against you? Could Washington himself speak, would

against you? Could Washington himself speak, would he cast the blame of that sectionalism upon us, who sustain his policy or upon you who repudiate it? We respect that warning of Washington, and we commend it to you, together with his example pointing to the right application of it.

But you say you are conservative—eminently conservative—while we are revolutionary, destructive, or something of the sort. What is conservation? It it not achierence to the old and tried, against the new and untried? We stick to, contend for, the identical old policy on the point in composers which was adopted by our fathers who framed the Government under which we live while you with one accord respects. under which we live; while you with one accord re-ject, and scout, and spit upon that old policy, and insist upon substituting something new. True, you disa-gree smong yourselves as to what that substitute shall ne. You have considerable variety of new propusihe. You have considerable variety of new proparitions and plane, but you are unanimous in rejecting
and denouncing the old policy of the fathers. Some of
you are for reviving the foreign slave-trade; some for
a Congressional Slave-Code for the Territories; some
for Congress forbibling the Territories to prohibit
Slavery within their limits; some for maintaining
Slavery in the Territories through the Judiciary;
rome for the "gur-rest pur-rinciple" that "if
one man would enslave another, no third
man should object," fantastically called "Popular
Sovereignty;" but never a man among you
in favor of Federal prohibition of Slavery
in Sederal critories according to the practice of our in Kederala erritories, according to the practice of our fathers who framed the Government under which we Not one of all your verious plans can show a secent or an advocate in the century within which our Government originated. Consider, then, whether

charge of destructiveness against us, are based on the most clear and stable foundations.

Again, you say we have made the Slavery question Again, you say we have made the Sizvery question more premipent than it formerly was. We deny it. We admit that it is more prominent, but we deny that we made it so. It was not we, but you, who discarded the old policy of the fathers. We resisted, and still resist, your innevation; and thence comes the greater promipence of the question. Would you have that question reduced to its former proportions? Go back to that old policy. What has been will be again, under the same conditions. If you would have the peace of the old times, re-adopt the precepts and policy of the

old times.
You charge that we stir up insurractions among your slaves. We dony it; [and what is your proof?

Harper's Ferry! John Brown!! John Brown was no Republican; and you have failed to implicate a single Republican in his Harper's Ferry enterprise. If any nember of our party is guilty in that matter, you know it or you do not know it. If you do know it, you are inexcusable to not designate the man and prove the

inexcusable to not designate the man and prove the fact. If you do not know it, you are inexcusable to assert if, and especially to persist in the assertion after you have tried and failed to make the proof. You need not be told that persisting in a charge which one does not know to be true, is simply malicious stander. Some of you admit that no Republican designedly aided or encouraged the Harper's Ferry affair; but still insist that our doctrines and declarations necessarily lead to such results. We do not believe it. We know we hold to no doctrines, and make no declarations which were not held to and made by our fathers who framed the Government under which we live. know we hold to no doctrines, and make he declarations which were not held to and made by our fathers who framed the Government under which we live. You never dealt fairly by us in relation to this affair. When it occurred, some important State elections were near at head, and you were in evident glee with the belief that, by charging the blame upon us, you could get an advantage of us in those elections. The elections came, and your expectations were not quite failfilled. Every Republican man knew that, as to himself at least, your charge was a slander, and he was not much inclined by it to cast his vote in your favor. Republican doctrines and declarations are accompanied with a continual protest against any interference whatever with your slaves, or with you about your slaves. Surely, this does not encourage them to revolt. True, we do, in common with our fathers who framed the Government under which we live, declare our belief that Slavery is wren; but the slaves do not hear us declare even this For anything we say or do, the slaves would scancely know there is a Republican party. I believe they would not, in fact, generally know it but for your misrer recentations of us, in their hearing. In your policies, extense wanny yourselves, each faction charges they would not, in fact, generally the misret recutations of us, in their hearing. In your political contests among yourselves, each faction charges the other with symmathy with Black Republicanism; and then, to give point to the charge, defines Black Republicanism to simply be insurrection, blood and thunder among the slaves.

Slave in urrections are no more common now Slave in urrections are no more common row than they were before the Republican party was organized. What induced the Sonthampton insurrection, twenty-eight years ago, in which at least three times as many lives were lost as at Harper's Ferry! You can scarcely stretch your very clastic fancy to the conclusion that Southampton was got up by Black Republicanism. In the present state of things in the United States, I do not think a general, or even a very extensive slave insurrection, is possible. The indispensable concert of action cannot be attained. The slaves have no means of rapid communication; nor can incendiary free men, black or communication; nor can incendiary free men, black or white, surp y it. The explosive materials are every-where in parcels: but there neither are, nor can be gu, plad, the indiscensable connecting trains. Much is said by Southern people about the affection

Much is said by Southern people about the affection of rlaves for their masters and mistresses; and a part of it, at least, is true. A plot for an uprising could scarcely be devised and communicated to twenty individuals before some one of them, to save the life of a favorite master or mistress, would divinge it. This is the role; and the slave-revolution in Hayti was not an exception to it, but a case occurring under peculiar erromsunces. The gunpowder plot of British history, though not connected with slaves, was more in point. In that case, only about twenty were admitted to the secret; and set one of them, in his anxiety to save a friend, betrayed the plot to that friend, and, by consequence, averted the calamity. Occasional poisonings from the kitchen, and open or stendthy assassinations in the field, and local revolute extending to a sinations in the field, and local revolts extending to score or so, will continue to occur as the natural re-sults of Slavery; but no general insurrection of slaves

suits of Siavery; but no general insurrection at save, as I think, can happen in this country for a long time. Wheever much tears, or much hopes, for such an event, will be alike disappointed.

In the language of Mr. Jefferson, uttered many years ago, "it is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation and deportation, peaceably, and in such slow degrees, as that the evil will wear off investible; and their places be, part passa, filled up usensibly; and their places be, pari passa, filed up by f ee white laborers. If, on the contrary, it is left o force itself on, human nature must shudder at the

prospect held up."

Mr. Jefferson did not mean to say, nor do I, that the power of emancipation is in the Federal Government. He sacks of Virginia; and, as to the power of emancipation, I speak of the slaveholding States only.

The Federal Government, however, as we insist, has the power of restraining the extension of the institution—the power to insare that a slave insurrection shall never occur on any American soil which is now free from Slavery.

free from Slavery.

John Brown's effort was peculiar. It was not a John Brown's effort was peculiar. It was not a slave insurrection. It was an attempt by white men to get up a revolt among slaves, in which the slaves refused to participate. In fact, it was so absurd that the slaves, with all their informace, saw plainly enough it could not succeed. That affair, in its poliosophy, corresponds with the many attempts, related in history, at the assessination of kings and emperors. An enthusiast broods over the oppression of a people, till he fair cies himself commissioned by Heaven to liberate them. He ventures the attempt, which ends in little ciec than in his own execution. Orani's attempt at Harper's Ferry were, in their philosophy, precisely the same. The engerness to cast blame on old England in the one case, and on New-England in the other, does not disprove the sameness of the two things.

not disprove the sameness of the two things.

And how much would it avail you, if you could, by the use of John Brown, Helper's book, and the like, break up the Republican organization? Human action can be medified to some extent, but human nature cannot be changed. There is a judgment and a feeling against Savery in this nation, which cast at least a milion and a half of votes. You cannot destroy that dgment and feeling-that sentiment-by breaking up can scarcely scatter and disperse an army which been formed into order in the face of your heaviest fire but if you could, how much would you gain by for sing the sentiment which created it out of the peaceful chan rel of the ballot box, into some other channel? What would that other channel probably be? Would the number of John Browns be lessened or enlarged by

the operation ?
But you will break up the Union, rather than submit to a cenial of your Constitutional rights.

That has a somewhat reckless sound: but it would be palliated, if not fully justified, were we proposing, by the mere force of numbers, to deprive you of some right, plainly written down in the Constitution. But

We are proposing no such thing.

When you make these declarations, you have a spe

when you make these declarations, you have a specific and well-understood alloason to an assumed Constitutional right of yours, to take slaves into the Federal Territories, and to hold them there as property. But no such right is specifically written in the Coastitution. That instrument is literally eilent about any such right. We, on the contrary, deny that such a right has any existence in the Constitution, even by invalidation.

implication.

Your purpose, then, plainly stated, is, that you will destroy the Government, unless you be allowed to destroy the Government, unless you be allowed to construe and enforce the Constitution as you please, or all points in dispute between you and us. You will

rule or ruin in all events.

This, plainty state d, is your language to us. Perhaps you will say the Supreme Court has decided the disputed Constitutional question in your favor. Not quite so. But, waiving the lawyers' distinction between dictum and decision, the Court have decided the question for you in a sort of way. The Court have substantially said, it is your Constitutional right to take slaves into the Federal Territories, and to hold them there as property.

take slaves into the Federal Territories, and to hold them there as property.

When I say the decision was made in a sort of way, I mean it was made in a divided Court by a bare majority of the Judges, and they not quite agreeing with one another in the reasons for making it; that it is so made as that its avowed supporters disagree with one another about its meaning; and that it was mainly based upon a mistaken statement of fact—the statement in the opinion that "the right of proporty in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution."

tution."
An inspection of the Constitution will show that the right of property in a slave is not distinctly and expressly affirmed in it. Hear in mind the Judges do not pledge their judicial opinion that such right is impliedly affirmed in the Constitution; but they pledge their veracity that it is distinctly and expressly affirmed there—"distinctly"—that is, in words meaning just that, without the aid of any inference, and succeptible of no other meaning.

If they had only pledged their judicial opinion that such right is affirmed in the instrument by implication.

such right is affirmed in the instrument by implication, it would be open to others to show that neither the It would be open to others to show that neither the word "sinve" nor "Sinvery" is to be found in the Constitution, nor the word "property" even, in any connection with language alluding to the things slave, or Slavery, and that wherever in that instrument the slave is alluded to, he is called a "person;" and wherever his matter's legal right in relation to him is silluded to, it is spoken of as "service or labor due," as a "debt" payable in service or labor. Also, it would be open to show, by colemporateous history, that be open to be open to show, by cotemporaneous history, that this mode of alluding to slaves and Slavery, instead of speaking of them, was employed on purpose to ex-clude from the Constitution the idea that there could

be property in man.

To show all this is easy and certain.

When this obvious mistake of the Judges shall be brought to their notice, is it not reasonable to expect that they will withdraw the mistaken statement, and

reconsider the conclusion based upon it?

And then it is to be remembered that "our fathers who framed the Government under which we live"—the men who made the Constitution—decided this same constitutional question in our favor, long ago-de-cided it without a division among themselves, when making the decision; without division among them-selves about the meaning of it after it was made, and

so far as any evidence is left without basing it upon any mistaken statement of facts.

Under all these circumstances, do you really feel yourselves justifier to break up this Government, notes such a court decision as yours is shall be at once submitted to as a conclusive and final rule of political

But you will not abide the election of a Republican

President. In that supposed event, you say, you will destroy the Union; and then, you say, the great crime of having destroyed it will be upon ns!

That is cool, A highwayman holds a pistol to my ear, and mutters through his teeth, "stand and deliver, or I shall kill you, and then you will be a murdered.

deter!"

To be sure, what the robber demanded of me—my money—was my own; and I had a clear right to keep it; but it was no more my own than my vote is my own; and the threat of death to me, to extort my money, and the threat of destruction to the Union, to extort my vote, can ecarcely be distinguished in principle. ciple.

A few words now to Republicans. It is exceed-A few words now to Republicans. It is exceedingly desirable that all parts of this great Conferacy shall be at pence, and in har nony, one with another. Let us Republicans do our part to have it so. Even though much provoked, let us do nothing through passion and ill temper. Even though the Southsrn people will not so much as listen to as, let us calmly confidently the southern and wild to them; in our delibition of the southern people will not so much as listen to as, let us calmly confidently the southern and wild to them; in our delibition.

ple will not so much as listen to us, let us calmly consider their demands, and yield to them it, in our deliberate view of our cuty, we possibly can. Jadging by all they say and do, and by the subject and nature of their controversy with us, let us determine, if we can, what will satisfy them?

Will they be satisfied if the Territories be unconditionally surrendered to them? We know they will not. In all their present complaints against ut, the Territories are scarcely mentisned. Invasions and insurrections are the rage now. Will it satisfy them if, in the fature, we have nothing to do with invasions and insurrections? We know it will not. We so know because we know we never had anything to do with invasions and insurrections; and yet this total abstaining does not exempt us from the charge and the denunciation. denunciation.

The question recurs, what will satisfy them? must, somehow, convince them that we do let them alone. This, we know by experience, is no easy task. We have been so to trying convince them, from the veby beginning of our organization, but with no success. In all our platforms and speeches, we have constantly pro ested our purpose to let them alone; but this has had no tendency to convince them. Alike unavailing to convince them is the fact that they have never de-

to convince them is the fact that they have never detected a man of us in any attempt to disturb them.

These natural, and apparently adequate means all failing, what will convince them? Tais, and this only cease to call slavery wrong, and join them in calling it right. And this must be done thoroughly—done in acts as well as in words. Silence will not be tolerated—we must place ourselves avowedly with them. Douglas's new section law must be enacted and enforce; empressing all declarations that slavery is wrong, whether made in politics, in presses, in pulpits, or in privide.

We must arrest and return their fugitive slaves with greedy pleasure. We must gull do on our Free-State constitutions. The whole atmosphere must be disinfected from all taint of opposition to Slavery, before they will cease to believe that all their troubles proceed from us.

I am quite aware they do not state their case precisely in this way. Most of them would probably say to us, "Let us alone, do nothing to us, and say what you please about Slavery." But we do let them alone—have never disturbed them—so that, after all, it is what we say, which dissatisfies them. They will continue to accurse us of doing, until we cease saying. I am a'so aware they have not, as yet, in terms, de-

am also aware they have not, as yet, in terms, de-manded the overthrow of our Free State Constitutions. Yet those Constitutions deciare the wrong of Slavery, with more solemn emphasis, than do all other sayings against it; and when all these other sayings shall have been silenced, the overthrow of these Constitutions will be demanded, and nothing be left to resist the demand. It is nothing to the contrary, that they do not demand the whole of this just now. Demanding what they do, and for the reason they do, they can what they do, and for the reason does not have two parties of the consummation. Holding as they do, that Slavery is morally right, and socially elevating, they cannot cease to demand a full national recognition of it, as a legal right, and a social Nor can we justifiably withold this, on any ground

save cur conviction that Slavery is wrong. If Slavery is right, all words, acts, laws, and Constitutions against it, are themselves wrong, and should be allenced, and swept away. If it is right, we mienced, and swept away. If it is right, we cannot justly object to its nationality—its universelity; if it is wrong, they cannot justly insist upon its extension—its enlargement. All they ask, we could readily grant, if we thought Slavery right; all we ask, they could as readily grant, if they thought it wrong. Their thinking it right, and our thinking it wrong, is the precise fact upon which depends the whole controversy. Thinking it right, as they do, they are not to blame for desiring its full recognition, as being right; but, thinking it wrong, as we do, can we yield to but, thinking it wrong, as we do, can we yield to

but, thinking it wrong, as we do, can we yield to them? Can we cast our votes with their view, and against our own? In view of our moral, social, and political responsibilities, can we do this? Wrong as we think Slavery is, we can yet afford to let it alone where it is, because that much is due to the necessity arising from its actual presence in the nation; but can we will nevert will never it is the nation; but can we, while our votes will prevent it, allow it to spread into the National Territories, and to overran us ere in these Free States?

here in these Free States?

If our sense of duty forbids this, then let us stand by our duty, fearlessly and effectively. Let us be diverted by none of those sophistical contrivances wherewith we are so industriously plied and belabored—contrivances such as groping for some middle ground between the right and the wrong, vain as the search for a man who should be neither a living man nor a dead mar—anch as a policy of "don't care" on a question about which all true men do care—such as Union appeals beseething true Union men to yield to Dismionist, reversing the divine rule, and calling, not the sinners, but the righteous to repentance—such

as invocations of Washington, imploring men to unsay what Washington said, and undo what Washington did. Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us, nor frightened from it by men-aces of destruction to the Government, nor of dungeors to ourselves. Let us have faith that right makes night; and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do ur duty, as we understand it.

Mr. Lincoln's speech excited frequent and irropress ble applause. His occasional repetition of his text never failed to provoke a burst of cheers and andible smiles. The completeness with which Popular Sovereignty and its progenitor were used up has rarely, if ever, been equaled. At the conclusion of his speech Mr. Lincoln received the congratulations of a large number of his friends and the friends of Republicanism.

Three cheers were then given for Wm. H. Seward, and some of the prominent Republicans on the plat form were called upon. In response to these calls, brief speeches were made by Horace Greeley, Gen. Jas. W. Nye, Jas. A. Briggs of Ohio, and Judge Culver of Brooklyn. The vast assemblage then quietly dispersed.

DEATH OF PROF. GOODRICH, OF YALE COLLEGE .-The Rev. Chauncey Allen Goodrich, D. D., Professor of Pastoral Theology at Yale College, died at his residence in New-Haven, on Saturday, the 25th inst. About ten lays prior to his decease he was attacked by bilions neumonia, from which he seemed likely to recover, ntil the morning of Saturday, when he was prostrated by a stroke of paralysis. At 41 o'clock, p. m., a second stroke out an end to his existence. Prof. Goodrich was born in New-Haven in the year

790. Graduating at Yale in 1810, he became a tutor n that College, and was afterward settled in the minstry, over a Congregational church at Middletown. Connecticut. In 1817 he was elected Professor of Rheteric and Oratory at Yale. This position he held until 1839, when he was transferred to the Professorship of Pastoral Theology, which he retained until his decease. In 1820 he declined the offered Presidency of Willian & College. During the last thirty years, he has been extensively

nown as the compiler of a Greek grammar, "Latin essons," and "Greek Lessons," and as the editor of The Quarterly Christian Spectator. In 1852, be editd a collection of speeches by the most eminent British orators, in one large octavo volume. But the chief labors of his later life, extraneous from the duties of his Professorship, were devoted to the extension and improvement of the Dictionary of his father-in-law, Dr. Noah Webster, several editions of which have been issued under his care. Prof. Goodrich was beloved by his associates, and

his memory will long be cherished by the thousands who have listened to his teachings, for the child-like tenderness of his character, his earnest Christian devotion, and the genial sympathy he ever manifested in the oys and sorrows of those around him. He was a classic scholar, a faithful teacher, a good man, and Yale College, together with the community in which he moved, must deeply regret his loss.

THE MEXICAN TREATY.

To the Editor of The N. Y. Tribune.

SIR: I avail myself of the liberty of free discussion allowed in your paper, to present some consideration beating upon the Treaty with Mexico, even at the risk of a hostile editorial rejoinder.

I will first dispose of what may be deemed the po itico-partisen aspect of the question. If I understand t aright, it is invisted upon by you, and perhaps in the minds of the Republican Senators it is the most formidable of all the objections that have been urged, that an opportunity is given to our Government, by the terms of the Treaty, to make itself a party belliverent in the civil war now existing in Mexico, and that the prevent Administration ought not to be trusted with a ower which may be percented to so dangerous a As you have not published the Treaty, I shall be

compelled to refer somewhat in detail to its pro-By article 5 it is stipulated that, should it become

necessary to employ a military force for the protection of the lives or property of citizens of the United States passing over any of the routes from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean, over which a free transit is guaranteed by Mexico, such force may be furnished by the United States, at the request of Mexico, or may be interposed without such request in case of imminent innger. The latter part of the provision was nadoubtdly suggested by the recent destruction of many lives and a large amount of property on the Panana Railroad, for which indemnity has been claimed by the slow process of diplomatic reclamation against a bankrupt Government, with the doubtful prospect of arything being paid over if the claim should be admit-

ted.

The routes referred to in the article are across the Isthmus of Tehnantepec. It would seem hardly to need argument to prove that so remote a part of the interior of Mexico could offer no inducement for an armed occupation with a claudestine intent of acquir-

Again, it is strongly insisted, in opposition to the treaty, that all the routes are valueless, and not likely the be used. This argument is put forward with reference to another condition of the treaty, viz. the pay of money by our Government for the right of way. But if it is well founded it effectually disposes of the object. if it is well founded it effectually disposes of the objection growing out of any apprehended intervention of an armed ferce for the maintenance of the right.

By article 7, of the Treaty, a similar right of way is granted from some point on the Rio Grande, in the State of Tamarlipus to Mazatlan, on the Gulf of California; also, from some point on the boundary line of Mexico and the United States, near the one handed and eleventh decreased.

Mexico and the United States, near the one handred and eleverth degree of longitude to the City of Goayanae, on the Gulf of California; the same protection is guaranteed and the same intervention by the United States is allowed.

In respect to these routes, no survey has been made or plan sdepted, and when that shall have been adopted we are admonished, by the slow progress of similar projects for railroads in the floarishing State of Texts, how remote must be the period of accomplishing anything of the kind in the wild and distant regions of Western Mexico. We may at least be sare that it will not be under the auspices of the present Administration.

tration. A more plausible ground for the objection may per A more plaurible ground for the objection may per-haps be found in the first article of the Convention to enforce the Treaty stipulations by which, in case of the violation of any such stipulations, or in case the safety of the citizens of the United States is endangered withof the citizens of the United States is endangered within the Territory of Mexico, it is made the duty of the letter, if unable to enforce order and security, to seek the aid of the United States for that purpose; and, in respect to disorders on the frontier, the authorities of both Republics are obligated to act in concert for the

both Kepholics are configured to the formula to the suppression of crime and the punishment of offenders.

That these provisions may not by possibility be liable to some abuse. I will not deny; but, so far as respects treaty stipulations, nothing is added to the power which our government has always claimed, and many times en'orced, of protecting its citizens in a foreign territory, the government of which has brough weakness or culpable neglect, allowed wrong,

with the recent forays to which our citizens have been exposed, will doubt that vigorous measures for their defense are called for. A military force is in fact indispensable for the repression of the lawless violence to which our border settlements are liable, and the only question is whether it shall be done under the authority of a treaty, or by virtue of the independent right and obligation of our government to protect its

One of your correspondents at Washington speaks of any mistary demonstration upon the fronter as good ground for the impeachment of the President. I good ground for the impeachment of the President. I regret to see in your paper such reckless and undersiminating expressions. Whatever may be chargeable against the present administration as a deteliction of public duty, I think that the protection of our citizens from murder and rapice, even by military force, if that be necessary, will not be held by the right-minded portion of the Republican party to be a just cause of centure.

It may be worth considering a little further the alternative action which is now in our option. Suppose this treaty to be rejected: is the frontier to be left un-defended? If not, and it should be found impossible to give effectual protection without an armed force put in occupation of the border States of Mexico, will our Government be justified in taking that measure? Whatever difference of opinion there might be apout this alternative, in the present state of parties in Mexico, there can be none that if the Miramon or Church party, which is known to be hostile to this country, should obtain the ascendancy, and that the disorders now existing in our neighborhood should be permitted to continue, whether by deliberate encouragement or a mere disregard of the rights of our citizens, it would be sufficient justification for the pursuit of marauders be sufficient justification for the pursuit of marauders into the adjoining territory and the establishment of such defenses there as would be effectual for the re-

pression of savage violence.

Again, suppose the not improbable case that the Again, suppose the not improbable case that the Church faction should obtain the intervention of a foreign power. It is well known that the French minister has already committed the country he represents to the support of that party; and to he instrumentality, or at least contivance, may be attributed the atrocities which have been committed in the city of Mexico against citizens of the United States. Can it be supposed that the continuance of such outrages would be submitted to by our Government, whenever it should have the right to charge them upon a responsible administration of a Mexican Republic! Would the wrong be in any degree ameliorated if it should be attributable to malian foreign influence! I know that the intervertion of France is treated by some of the opponents of the treaty as a mere scare-crow—something the intervention of France is treated by some of the op-ponents of the treaty as a mere scare-crow—somathing got up for the present occasion by persons having a mercena y interest in the adoption of the treaty. But what better evidence could we have of what might be expected hereafter than what has been already emact-ed by the representative of France, fully approved as his action has been by the government he represents. Whatever might be the effect of the ratification of the treaty between the United States and Mexico, in pre-venting the consummation of foreign machinations to our prejudice, it is certain that the announcement by our government of its indifference to the affairs of Mex-ico, would necessarily throw that unhappy country into the rands of one or other of the European powers.

the bands of one or other of the European powers.

The second objection relates to the payment of
\$4,000,000 by the United States to Mexico. Half of this is to be retained for the satisfaction of the claims of citizens of the United States upon the Government of citizens of the United States upon the Government of Mexico. Is there an equivalent in the treaty for the \$2,000,000 which is to be paid over to Mexico? It is an inexcusable perversion to treat this as a mere purchase of a right of way to the Pacific Ocean. The treaty itself (Art. 10) specifies as the consideration for this payment not merely the stipulations for such right of way, but the concession by Mexico of the transit of goods free of duty through its territory. To this should be added whatever advantage we may derive from the commercial clause (Art. 8). Before, however, discussing the latter provision, a single remark will be proper to respect to the \$2,000,000 reserved by the United States.

tates. It is boldly asserted by your correspondent that there

It is boldly asserted by your correspondent that there are no legitimate claims against Mexico, the freaty of Gaudalupe Hidalgo having disposed of them I cannot suppose that he is ignorant of the history of the Commission which was constituted under that treaty to set the the claims of our citizens, and of course he must know that while a large amount was allowed to parties who were entitled to nothing (as in the case of Gardiner, who was afterward convicted of frand), yet that meritorious claims of a much larger amount were jeeted upon a technical and untenable ground.

It would not be proper to say more upon that subject in this discussion, but I will undertake to show wherever the question shall be fairly presented, that our Government cannot with justice refuse to give relief in some of those cases. But, aside from toose, it into a matter of notoriety that during the late civid disorders in Mexico great ourrages have been committed upon our citizens? What would be the measure of indemnity, I have no means of judging. It can hardly, however, admit of don't that the eum named is matter quate. It, however, rests with our Government to provide for its own citizens. If the sum is not large means, it should be increased, or the deficit should be vide for its own citizens. If the sum is not large enough, it should be increased; or the deficit should be assumed by our Government, if an equivalent is to be